## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI NORTHERN DIVISION

DANIEL EDWARD RULO,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) No. 2:21-CV-50 NA
ANNE L. PRECYTHE, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon its own motion. Self-represented plaintiff Daniel Edward Rulo's complaint for money damages was received by the Court for filing on July 27, 2021. However, plaintiff neither paid the \$402 court filing fee nor filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (or without prepayment of fees or costs), along with a certified copy of his account statement. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). As such, the Court will allow plaintiff twenty-one (21) days to either pay the full filing fee or file his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and account statement. His failure to do so in a timely manner will result in a dismissal of this action, without prejudice.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Clerk is directed to mail to plaintiff a copy of the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* form for prisoners.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff must either pay the \$402 filing fee **or** submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* within twenty-one (21) days of the date of this Order.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a court order to have "money removed from his savings." The Court does not collect filing fees in such a way. Rather, a plaintiff must either submit a certified money order to the court to pay the filing fee in full, or he may seek leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if plaintiff files a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, he must also file a certified copy of his prison account statement for the six-month period preceding the filing of the complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for court order to have money removed from his savings [ECF No. 2] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that if plaintiff fails to comply with this Order, the Court will dismiss this action without prejudice. If the case is dismissed for non-compliance with this Order, the dismissal will **not** count as a "strike" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

Dated this 9th day of August, 2021.

NANNETTE A. BAKER

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Nath lish